REMARKS

Claims 1-6 and 8-14 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1-5 and 9-12 are amended. Support for amendments to claims 1-5 and 9-12 can be found, for example, at pages 4 and 5 and Figs. 3 and 10. Thus, no new matter is added.

I.   The Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter

Claims 1-6 and 8-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,308,225 B1 to Schofield ("Schofield") in view of "Applied Operating System Concepts" by Silberschatz et al. ("Silberschatz"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1-5 and 9-12 are amended to recite additional features.

The Office Action acknowledges that Schofield does not disclose a hardware interface. The Office Action asserts that Silberschatz discloses the claimed hardware interface, and thus remedies the deficiencies with respect to Schofield.

Schofield and Silberschatz, alone or in a permissible combination, do not teach or suggest every feature of claims 1-6 and 8-14. For example, Schofield does not disclose wherein the hardware interface includes a function identifying a device register, as recited in amended independent claim 1, and as similarly recited in amended claims 2-5 and 9-12.

Further, Schofield does not disclose defining a hardware interface, using a first interface definition language which is <u>partly common</u> to a second interface definition language directed to a software object <u>such that a part of the first interface definition language and a part of the second interface definition language use the same language to specify an interface name, a function name, and an argument and a return value for each function</u>, as recited in amended independent claim 1, and as similarly recited in amended claims 2-5.

Silberschatz does not remedy the deficiencies discussed above with respect to Schofield. Silberschatz merely discloses that remote hardware devices can be accessed from different sites (see Silberschatz, page 470). Nowhere does Silberschatz disclose a hardware

interface that is defined in an interface definition language and the hardware interface includes a function identifying a device register, as recited in claim 1, and similarly recited in claims 2-5 and 9-12. Nowhere does Silberschatz disclose a hardware interface that is defined in an interface definition language that is common to an interface definition language that is used to define a software object, as recited in claim 1, and similarly recited in claims 2-5.

Therefore, neither Schofield nor Silberschatz discloses the subject matter as recited in amended independent claims 1-5 and 9-12.

For at least these reasons, independent claims 1-5 and 9-12 are patentable over Schofield and Silberschatz. Further, claims 6, 8, 13 and 14, which variously depend from independent claims 3, 5, 10 and 12 are also patentable over Schofield and Silberschatz, for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to independent claims 1-5 and 9-12, as well as for the additional features they recite. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

II.   Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Gang Luo
Registration No. 50,559

JAO:PQW/mef

Date: June 12, 2008

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION
Please grant any extension
necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 15-0461